

2006-2011 CLARK COUNTY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGE #
PARTICIPANTS	
INTRODUCTION	1
WHAT IS IN THIS PROGRAM?	1
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT	3
PROCESS SUMMARY	3
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS	4
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	5
PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM	6
EVALUATION CRITERIA	7
PROGRAMMING CONSIDERATIONS	14
TITLE VI AND VII COMPLIANCE	14
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS	15
FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES	15
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)	17
STATE FUNDING SOURCES	17
LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES	19
TIP EXPENDITURES	22
REASONABLY FUNDED PROJECTS	24
ILLUSTRATIONS	
FIGURE 1: 2006-2011 COUNTY ROAD FUND BREAKDOWN	19
FIGURE 2: 2006-2011 TIP ROAD FUND FORECAST	20
FIGURE 3: 2006-2011 TIP FUNDING SOURCES	22
FIGURE 4: 2006-2011 EXPENDITURE CLASSIFICATION	23

PARTICIPANTS

This document represents a collaborative effort between the Transportation Improvement Program Involvement Team (TIPIT), individual citizens, and Clark County staff. Thank you to all who participated in the development of the program.

Transportation Improvement Program Involvement Team

Lynne Griffith – C-TRAN
Bud Van Cleve – NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood
Phil Wuest – City of Vancouver
Jake Schnoebelen – Salmon Creek
Jim Carothers – City of Camas
John McKibben – Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce
Shane McKenzie – City of Battle Ground
Skip Leuschner – Ridgefield
Bud Ledbetter – Laidlaw Transit
Marilyn Roth – Fir Park
Dale Robbins – Regional Transportation Council (RTC)
Pam Neal – Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC)
Mike Viles – Bicycle Advisory Committee
Darrell Haynes – Brush Prairie
Winston Jacobson – Camas
Heidi Rosenberg – Vancouver School District

Clark County Staff

Peter Capell – Director of Public Works
Bill Wright – Public Works Programming Manager
Dave Shepard – Public Works Operations
Mike Mabrey – Community Development Long Range Planning
Craig Randall – Clark County Sheriff's Office
Karen Streeter – Public Works Environmental Manager
Lowell Weiss – Public Works Real Property Services Manager
Dan Kaler – Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
Mike Emrick – Public Works Design
Matt Hall – Public Works Project Management
Rob Klug – Public Works Transportation Systems
Ejaz Khan – Public Works Transportation Systems
Richard Gamble – Public Works Concurrency
Robin Washington – Public Works Programming
Susan Wilson – Public Works Programming

INTRODUCTION

Limited resources, combined with increasing transportation demands in the area, make Clark County's 2006-2011 Six-Year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) essential to achieve the goals and objectives of the County Comprehensive Plan. The TIP uses objective criteria to evaluate and prioritize the many possible road improvement projects. The TIP assigns available revenues to the projects to achieve the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, regional transportation priorities, and to recognize the vision set by the community and the Board of County Commissioners.

Aside from the practical reasons for developing the TIP, there are legal requirements to consider. The laws of the state of Washington (RCW 136.15.050, rev.) require the preparation and annual updating of a six-year comprehensive transportation program. The TIP shall be adopted by the county legislative authority each year and shall include all anticipated road and bridge construction projects, capital ferry expenditures, paths and trails projects, and any other specified capital outlays for the following six-year period.

Questions or comments regarding the content or development of this program can be directed to Clark County Customer Service at (360) 397-6118, extension 4944.

WHAT IS IN THIS PROGRAM?

The remainder of this document includes:

- A description of the process used to develop the program,
- An analysis of financial constraints,
- The Six-Year Program Funding Matrix,
- The Annual Construction Program for 2006,
- A map index of projects included in the program,
- Detail sheets for all funded projects in the program.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

PROCESS SUMMARY

The development of the Transportation Improvement Program includes the following steps and processes:

- Define Vision - Define the Board of County Commissioners' vision and expectations, and obtain endorsement for the TIP development process.
- Assemble Project Team - Establish a project team with the resources to execute the TIP development plan.
- Develop Public Involvement Plan - Provide a forum for meaningful public understanding and input into the program.*
- Review Existing Program - Define successful elements of the previous TIP and potential areas for improvement.
- Identify Candidate Projects - Establish initial list of projects.*
- Prepare Evaluation Criteria - Create a clearly defined list of quantifiable and/or qualitative measures for project evaluation.*
- Collect Data - Prepare a scope, preliminary estimate, and graphic representation of each project. Provide supplementary data for evaluation criteria.*
- Evaluate Projects - Measure and rank each project based upon evaluation criteria and supporting data.*
- Draft Plan - Compile a working document for review and refinement.
- Review Draft Plan - Gain input and comments from stakeholders.
- TIP Adoption - Board of County Commissioners adopts the TIP through a public hearing process.
- Assess Plan - Continual refinement and improvement of plan and development process.

* This step is executed on even years only.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

An important component of the Transportation Improvement Program is to provide the public with the opportunity to provide input into the development of the program. The purpose of the Public Involvement Program is to reflect public consensus on allocating resources for transportation capital improvements. Clark County Public Works coordinates with a cross-section of community members, representing a variety of different interests, to identify general and specific community sentiment on issues relating to the transportation needs of the community.

The Public Involvement Process is based on a biennial cycle. During odd-numbered years, the public involvement process is limited to individual contacts from the public and the Public Hearing to adopt the TIP. A full involvement process is undertaken during even-numbered years, which includes the identification of potential TIP projects, and the review of the project evaluation system.

The following is a summary of the public outreach efforts that occur during the even-numbered years:

- Community open houses;
- Transportation Improvement Program Involvement Team meetings;
- Organized presentations to neighborhood and business associations;
- Internet web site;
- Current TIP and map displayed in the Vancouver Library; and
- Press releases and newspaper advertisements.

The focal point of the public involvement process is the Transportation Improvement Program Involvement Team (TIPIT). The TIPIT consists of a group of approximately 30 citizens and county staff, representing a wide range of views and backgrounds. The role of the TIPIT is to assist the County with identifying projects, refining the project evaluation criteria, developing the project priority array, reviewing the draft TIP, and recommending a program to the county engineer.

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Capital Improvement Projects

Projects within the Transportation Improvement Program include new roadways, roadway widening, bridges, preservation projects, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. With the exception of the Ongoing Programs, we currently identify new projects on a biennial cycle, concurrent with the public involvement process. With few exceptions, no capital improvement projects are considered without ample opportunity for public input.

Ongoing Programs Projects

The Ongoing Programs Projects were established to address the completion of minor improvements and small-scale projects in specific categories. These programs consist of:

- Transportation Safety Improvement Program;
- Sidewalk and ADA Compliance Program;
- Neighborhood Traffic Management Program;
- Environmental Impact Mitigation Program;
- Un-programmed/Advanced Right-of-way Purchases Program; and
- Road Preservation Program.

See the ongoing programs detail sheets section for a description of each of the ongoing programs.

Projects within the ongoing programs are brought forward by citizens and staff throughout the year as needs are identified. Safety and pedestrian projects considered for funding are generally taken from the Roadway Conditions Inventory Report which is updated annually.

PROJECT EVALUATION SYSTEM

Project evaluation is performed on a biennial cycle during even-numbered years, concurrent with the public involvement process and applies only to the capital improvement projects, not to the ongoing programs. Occasionally, a project may bypass the ranking process due to an emergency situation or to develop a regionally significant project in conjunction with an adjoining agency (i.e. WSDOT or City of Vancouver). Bridge projects often bypass the ranking system also as they are ranked and evaluated separately in the annual bridge report.

The evaluation system is designed to provide an objective means to evaluate projects and rank them accordingly. Listed below are the nine (9) measurement criteria that form the basis of the evaluation system:

- Safety (considering both collision data and exposure);
- Comparison to the Arterial Atlas;
- Concurrency;
- Multimodal;
- Route Connectivity;
- Environmental Impacts;
- Public/Agency Support;
- Support for Economic Development; and
- Leveraging of Outside (non-County) Funding

Based upon the established evaluation criteria, a weighted scoring system measures and assigns a numbered rank to each project. The system recognizes safety, mobility, and future development potential as the most important considerations in the ranking of projects. The system is outlined on the following pages.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Safety (Maximum Score = 30, Weight = 1)

The safety criteria consider two significant measures of safety for a potential project. The first measure, or *collision score*, assigns points to a project based on actual collision history. The second measure, referred to as the *exposure score*, quantifies the sub par conditions that the project is intended to address.

Collision History:

The collision index considers the accident rate and the critical accident rate within the limits of each project. The *accident rate* is the total number of accidents per million vehicles traveling through the project area. The *critical accident rate* is the rate expected due to normal variation. The *collision index* is the ratio of the accident rate to the critical rate. An index greater than one indicates that the intersection or corridor experiences more collisions than expected under normal conditions.

Accident rates are calculated according to the type of project under consideration as follows (Note: ADT = Average Daily Traffic):

$$\text{Corridor Accident Rate} = \frac{\text{Total \# of Accidents} \times 10^6}{\text{Segment Length} \times \text{ADT} \times \text{Years} \times 365}$$

$$\text{Intersection Accident Rate} = \frac{\text{Total \# of Accidents} \times 10^6}{\text{ADT Entering} \times \text{Years} \times 365} \quad (\text{for intersection projects only})$$

The critical rate is calculated from the following formula:

$$\text{Critical Rate} = \bar{R} + k \times \sqrt{\frac{\bar{R}}{m}} + \frac{1}{2 \times m}$$

Where:

$$\bar{R} = 2.12 \text{ for segment}$$

$$\bar{R} = 0.80 \text{ for intersections}$$

$$k = 1.645 \text{ (constant)}$$

$$m = \text{ADT} \times \text{Years} \times 365 \times \text{Length} / 10^6$$

The collision index is then calculated:

$$\text{Collision Index} = \frac{\text{Accident Rate}}{\text{Critical Rate}}$$

Finally, interpolation from the following scale provides the collision portion of the safety score:

<u>Collision Index</u>	<u>Collision Score</u>
◇ equal to or greater than 1.8	65
◇ equal to 1.0	20
◇ equal to .5	10
◇ equal to 0	0

Exposure:

The exposure score is a summation of several measures regarding the existing conditions in the field. Once those conditions are measured, the score is modified by the exposure index to account for the number of vehicles actually exposed to those conditions.

<u>Exposure Measure</u>	<u>Score</u>
-------------------------	--------------

Existing Shoulder Widths:

◇ Between 0 and 1 foot wide	5
◇ Between 1 and 2 feet wide	3.75
◇ Between 2 and 4 feet wide	2.50
◇ Between 4 and 8 feet wide	1.25
◇ Greater than 8 feet wide	0

Fixed Objects Adjacent to the Roadway (average number of objects per 100 feet of roadway):

◇ 4 or more objects per 100 feet of roadway	5
◇ Between 3 and 4 objects per 100 feet of roadway	3.75
◇ Between 2 and 3 objects per 100 feet of roadway	2.50
◇ Between 1 and 2 objects per 100 feet of roadway	1.25
◇ 0 objects per 100-feet of roadway	0

Roadside Drop-off (distances from edge of roadway to bottom of hill, gully, etc.):

◇ 30 feet and greater	5
◇ Between 20 and 30 feet	3.75
◇ Between 10 and 20 feet	2.50
◇ Between 1 and 10 feet	1.25
◇ Less than 1 foot	0

Bike Lanes (widths of existing bike lanes in urban area or shoulders in rural area; separated paths may be considered wider than actual):

◇ Between 0 and 2.5 feet	5
◇ Between 2.5 and 4 feet	3
◇ Between 4 and 5 feet	1
◇ 5 feet or more	0

Sidewalks (existing sidewalks or walkways along project corridor):

- | | |
|--|------|
| ◇ No existing sidewalks (shoulders for rural projects) | 5 |
| ◇ Some existing sidewalks (at least 65%) | 2.50 |
| ◇ Existing sidewalks along full length of project | 0 |

Pedestrian Safety:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ◇ Includes frontage to a school, park, or other high-volume source of pedestrian or bicycle use | 5 |
| ◇ Directly serves a school or other high-volume source of pedestrian or bicycle use | 3 |

Other Issues (horizontal/vertical alignment, sight distance, intersection alignment)

- | | |
|--|---|
| ◇ Existing alignment, sight distance deficiencies | 5 |
| ◇ No existing alignment, sight distance deficiencies | 0 |

$$\text{Exposure Index} = \left(\frac{\text{AADT}}{1,000} \right) \leq 1.0 \quad (\text{maximum value of 1})$$

Exposure Score = Exposure Index x Sum of Exposures (maximum score = 35 points)

Raw Safety Score = Collision Score + Exposure Score (maximum score = 100 points)

There is a maximum of 100 points that a project can accrue from the eight elements in the safety category as previously shown (65 points for collision history and 35 points for exposure). Once a project has been scored against these elements and a score total has been derived, the project is assigned a final score for the safety criteria as follows:

$$\text{Final Safety Score} = \text{Safety Score} \times \left(\frac{30}{100} \right)$$

Comparison to County Arterial Atlas (Maximum Score = 5, Weight = 2)

Comparison of project's existing roadway section with section specified in the County Arterial Atlas:

- | | |
|---|---|
| ◇ Requires additional travel lanes | 1 |
| ◇ Requires center/left-turn lane | 2 |
| ◇ Requires sidewalks (shoulders for rural) | 1 |
| ◇ Requires bike lanes (shoulders for rural) | 1 |
| ◇ Other projects | 0 |

Concurrency (Maximum Score = 10, Weight = 1.5)

Concurrency standards are measured in terms of “average travel speed” for corridors (measured by standards set forth in Chapter 12.41, Transportation Concurrency Management System), and Level of Service (LOS) for intersections (LOS measured by standards set forth in the Highway Capacity Manual, with LOS E indicating failure):

- ◇ The project will improve one or more intersections of regional significance that are:
 - ◇ Failing 6
 - ◇ Within 10% of failing 4
- ◇ The project will improve an adopted concurrency corridor that is:
 - ◇ Failing (below the threshold corridor speed) 3
 - ◇ Within 3 mph of failing 2
- ◇ The project will improve conditions in an adopted transportation moratorium area 1
 - ◇ Does not address any concurrency or LOS concerns 0

Multimodal (Maximum Score = 6, Weight = 1)

Transit or bike/pedestrian system improvements (note that addition of bike lanes and sidewalks is included in the “Comparison to County Arterial Atlas” criteria above):

- ◇ Completes missing links in existing bike/pedestrian system 2
- ◇ Improves access to a Park & Ride Facility 2
- ◇ Improves the operation of a C-TRAN route within project limits 2

Route Connectivity (Maximum Score = 5, Weight = 2)

Project’s link with other arterial and collector routes:

- ◇ Project is linked to primary route (arterial or above) AND secondary route (collector) 3
- OR**
- ◇ Project links two primary routes 2
- OR**
- ◇ Project links two secondary routes 1
- ◇ Gap project 2
- ◇ Other projects 0

Environmental Mitigation (Maximum Score = 6, Weight = 1)

Based upon preliminary review by County staff, each project will be given a score of 6 and then points will be deducted, based on the following impacts types (lowest possible score = 0):

- | | |
|--|-----|
| ◇ No significant impacts anticipated | 0 |
| ◇ Low category wetland impact (roadside ditches, Category 4 wetlands) | (3) |
| ◇ Medium category wetland impact (cumulative impacts/Category 2, 3 wetlands) | (4) |
| ◇ High category wetland impact (Category 1 wetlands includes ESA impacts) | (5) |
| ◇ Stream impact (with or without wetland impact) | (3) |
| ◇ Shoreline impact (with or without wetland impact) | (2) |
| ◇ Wetland/habitat fragmentation impact | (6) |

Public and Outside Agency Support (Maximum Score = 2, Weight = 1):

- | | |
|--|---|
| ◇ Supported by the Regional Transportation Council, State Transportation Plan, or surrounding cities | 1 |
| ◇ Supported by the Public (TIPIT, adopted neighborhood circulation plan) | 1 |
| ◇ No known support by public or local agencies | 0 |

Support for Economic Development (Maximum Score = 15, Weight = 1)

The number of potential future jobs used for scoring the projects is determined as follows:

1. The following property within one half-mile of the project limits is determined using GIS data:

For vacant industrial property:

Primary	9 jobs/gross acre
Secondary	9 jobs/gross acre
Tertiary	4.5 jobs/gross acre

For commercial property:

Vacant	20 jobs/gross acre
Under-utilized	20 jobs/gross acre
Vacant with critical	20 jobs/gross acre

2. The potential future jobs are calculated by multiplying the total acreage times the job/gross acre. Values for jobs/gross acre (shown above) are based on adopted land use planning criteria for Clark County. Those values take into account loss of land to infrastructure and environmental constraints.

3. The potential future number of jobs in the area is then used to determine the score.

◇ Improves access to or is within an adopted Focused Public Investment Area:	5
◇ Potential future industrial jobs within half-mile of project:	
◇ 1,250 or more	7
◇ 1,000 to 1,249	5
◇ 750 to 999	3
◇ 250 to 749	1
◇ Potential future commercial jobs within half-mile of project:	
◇ 800 or more	3
◇ 450 to 799	2
◇ 250 to 449	1
◇ Other projects	0

Leveraging of Non-County Funding (Maximum Score = 6, Weight = 1)

State/Federal grant sources, regional, municipal, or other non-county funds:

◇ 80% outside funds available	6
◇ 70% outside funds available	5
◇ 60% outside funds available	4
◇ 50% outside funds available	3
◇ 10% outside funds available	2
◇ No funds committed	0

The scores within each criterion are multiplied by the weighting factor to give a total score for the criteria. The sum of the nine criteria scores result in a total score and ranking for the project. Refer to the attached Priority Array for project specific scoring and ranking information.

The outcome of the scoring/ranking process defines the priority for each project. The resulting Priority Array is used as the starting point to decide which projects are funded in the next six years.

In past years, there was concern expressed as to the rationale for evaluating and ranking projects that are currently underway. The concern is that these projects have previously been evaluated and targeted for completion, thereby obligating the County to finish the project. In order to address this issue, the TIPIT recommended removing these projects from the ranking order.

To separate those projects, an "Obligated" category was created. If a project has 10% or greater of its total projected cost already expended, the project is considered to be one that the County is committed to completing and therefore is assigned an "obligated" status. The expending of 10% or greater of a project's budget generally indicates that, at

a minimum, the engineering is well underway and the project has entered the right-of-way phase.

Obligated projects are listed alphabetically and assigned a letter in that order. The assigned letter does not indicate priority in any way.

PROGRAMMING CONSIDERATIONS

After establishing the priority array, available program dollars are assigned to projects with consideration to the following:

- The priority array,
- Available grant funds,
- Available TIF funds, and
- Regional transportation priorities.

The Six-Year Program Matrix only displays those projects that have funding in at least one phase of the project during the next six years.

TITLE VI AND VII COMPLIANCE

Clark County operating policies reflect official commitment that there shall be opportunity, free from discrimination, for all persons. The policy refers to employment, the provision of all County services, and services of its contractors. The County's practices of non-discrimination are consistent with Title VI and VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, as amended.

Federal and state grants require that the County, its contractors, subcontractors, and other sub-recipients who receive federal funds actively ensure non-discrimination in all of their programs and activities. These obligations apply even if those other programs and activities are not federally funded. It is County policy to afford all bidders an equal opportunity to quote and compete on equal terms. Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) is encouraged to respond to every applicable contracting opportunity. The County will ensure all businesses a realistic opportunity to participate in the County's purchasing processes, fairly and competitively.

If you have questions about the federal funding process, you are encouraged to contact the Public Works Department at (360) 397-6118.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

There are several funding sources available for the engineering and construction of transportation improvements in Clark County. The County Road Fund provides the principal source of program dollars. This local money is supplemented by Federal and State grant dollars administered through different offices. Below is a brief description of available funds, along with a brief explanation of projected revenues from each source (see Figure 3 on page 22 for percentage of program funded by the various grants).

FEDERAL FUNDING SOURCES

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiently Act (ISTEA) of 1991, the subsequent Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) of 1998, and the newest Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA-LU) of 2005 has set the bar for federal funding. SAFETEA-LU guarantees funding for highways, highway safety, and public transportation and represents the largest surface transportation investment in our Nation's history, totaling \$244.1 billion 2006 through 2009. SAFETEA-LU builds on this firm foundation, supplying the funds and refining the programmatic framework for investments needed to maintain and grow our vital transportation infrastructure.

SAFETEA-LU addresses the many challenges facing our transportation system today – challenges such as improving safety, reducing traffic congestion, improving efficiency in freight movement, increasing intermodal connectivity, and protecting the environment – as well as laying the groundwork for addressing future challenges. SAFETEA-LU promotes more efficient and effective Federal surface transportation programs by focusing on transportation issues of national significance, while giving State and local transportation decision makers more flexibility for solving transportation problems in their communities.

The specific grant programs available for Clark County through SAFETEA-LU include the following:

- **Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP).** This program's objective is to replace or rehabilitate roadway bridges conveying public roads over waterways, railroads, canals, and other barriers. Approximately \$20 million is available statewide each year through a statewide competition. The amount available for Clark County will fluctuate, depending on specific project needs. Clark County was awarded funds for three projects in 2004, which include:
 - Daybreak Bridge - Daybreak Road at East Fork Lewis River
 - Lucia Falls Bridge - Hantwick Road at East Fork Lewis River
 - Kline Line Bridge - NE Highway 99 at Salmon Creek at Salmon Creek
- **Surface Transportation Program - Clark County Transportation Management Area (STP-TMA).** The objective of the STP program is to fund road construction,

reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation. Approximately \$2 to \$4 million per year will be allocated to the Clark County Transportation Management Area (TMA), which consists of Clark County and the City of Vancouver. Projects funded by this Surface Transportation Program are selected by the Regional Transportation Council (RTC). C-TRAN, RTC, and WSDOT are also eligible for these funds. Clark County's share is based upon RTC's current TIP and expected future funding awards. In 2005, Clark County was awarded \$1.1 million for NE 72nd Avenue and \$1.2 million for NE 88th Street construction.

- **Surface Transportation Program – Hazard Elimination System (HES).** Under TEA-21, some STP funds are allocated for two safety categories (Group 1 - larger and signal projects; Group 2 - smaller and guardrail projects). The next call for projects is subject to the re-authorization of TEA-21.
- **Surface Transportation Program - Transportation Enhancements (STP-Enhancement).** Under TEA-21, 10% of STP funds are set aside for transportation enhancement projects. These can be bicycle and pedestrian "transportation projects", scenic or historic highways, and highway beautification (landscaping). The next call for projects is subject to the re-authorization of TEA-21.
- **Surface Transportation Program - Statewide Competition (STP-Competitive).** The goal of the program is to fund regionally significant projects and programs that develop, improve, and/or preserve an integrated transportation system that encourages multimodal choices to the public. The STP Competitive Program was allocated about \$85M over the life of TEA -21. TIB allocated the remaining STP competitive funds, \$22M, in December of 2000. The next call for projects is subject to the re-authorization of TEA-21.
- **Surface Transportation Program - Rural Assistance (STP-Rural).** TEA-21 requires STP funding for rural projects. Approximately \$250,000 is targeted for Clark County and small cities in the County each year. The next call for projects is subject to the re-authorization of TEA-21.
- **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ).** This funding is for projects that create a direct air quality benefit, leading toward attainment or maintenance of a National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). The funds will be used for non-roadway improvement projects such as bus or HOV lanes, traffic signal coordination, bike lanes, and other congestion mitigation activities. RTC selects projects for funding. The next call for projects is subject to the reauthorization of TEA-21.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT (CDBG)

Block grants are targeted for low and moderate income areas. Improvements usually consist of sidewalk and capital improvements. If an applicable project arises, Clark County will apply for CDBG grants.

STATE FUNDING SOURCES

Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)

The Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) administers several state-funded grant programs. The TIB's mission is to fund "high priority transportation projects in communities throughout the state to enhance the movement of people, goods, and services".

- **Urban Corridor Program (UCP)** formally the Transportation Partnership Program (TPP). This program was established by the State of Washington in 1988 as the Transportation Improvement Account (TIA) and was designated as the TPP in July 1999. The TIB requires multi-agency planning and coordination and public/private cooperation to further the goal of achieving a balanced transportation system in Washington State. Projects must be attributable to congestion caused by economic development or growth; and be consistent with state, regional, and local comprehensive plans. Local funds must provide a minimum 10- 20% match. TIB funded 10 Projects statewide in the FY 2007 Program for a total of \$34.45 million.
- **Urban Arterial Program (UAP)** formally the Arterial Improvement Program (AIP). This program was established by the State in 1967 and is funded by the Urban Arterial Trust Account (UATA). The purpose of this program is to fund arterial road projects to reduce congestion and improve safety, geometrics, and structural concerns. Project selection criteria include pavement condition, pavement and roadway width, traffic, accidents, and people-carrying capacity. Projects can receive a maximum 80% reimbursement, depending on agency population. TIB funded 13 Projects statewide in the FY 2007 Program for a total of \$27.35 million.
- **Urban Sidewalk Program (USP)** the formally Pedestrian Safety and Mobility Program (PSMP). This program was established by the TIB in 1994 as the Pedestrian Facilities Program (TIA-PFP) and was designated as the PSMP in July 1999. This program is also funded by the Urban Arterial Trust Account (UATA). The purpose of the program is to enhance and promote pedestrian mobility by providing funding for pedestrian projects that provide access and connectivity of pedestrian facilities. Selection criteria include safety, pedestrian generators, convenience, public acceptance, and project cost. The FY 2007 program totals to over \$2 million.

County Road Administration Board (CRAB)

The County Road Administration Board (CRAB) was created by the Legislature in 1965 to provide statutory oversight of Washington's thirty-nine (39) county road departments. The agency is funded from the portion of the counties' fuel tax that is withheld for state supervision and from a small portion of the two grant programs that the agency administers. The Board establishes and maintains "Standards of Good Practice" to guide and ensure consistency and professional management of county road departments in the State of Washington.

- **Rural Arterial Program (RAP).** In 1983, the legislature created the RAP to help finance the reconstruction of rural arterial roads. The program is funded with 0.58 cents of the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (MVFT). That level of funding generates approximately \$35 million per biennium.
- **County Arterial Preservation Program (CAPP).** In 1990, the legislature created a second grant program to be administered by CRAB. Similar to the Department of Transportation's Highway Preservation Program, CAPP is designed to assist counties in preserving their existing paved arterial road networks. The program is funded with 0.45 cents of the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax (MVFT), which generates approximately \$24 million per biennium. Clark County receives approximately \$500,000 per year in CAPP funds.

Washington State Public Works Board

The Public Works Board was created by the 1985 Legislature. The Board is comprised of local government officials, special purpose district representatives, and private sector members. The mission of the Washington State Public Works Board is "to assist Washington's local governments and private water systems in meeting their public works needs to sustain livable communities." The Board is authorized to loan money to counties, cities, and special purpose districts to repair, replace, or create domestic water systems, sanitary sewer systems, storm water systems, roads, streets, solid waste and recycling facilities, and bridges. The Public Works Board offers the following programs.

- **Public Works Trust Fund (PWTF) Construction Loan Program.** The PWTF Construction Loan Program provides funds to repair, replace, or create a facility. These loans have a 20-year term, with an interest rate as low as one-half percent. The maximum for any agency is ten million dollars per biennium.
- **Public Works Trust Fund Pre-Construction Loan Program.** The PWTF Pre-construction Loan Program provides funds for right-of-way acquisition, design work, engineering, permit acquisition, environmental review, and public notification. These loans have a five-year term, with an interest rate of only one-half percent. The maximum for any agency is one million dollars per biennium.

LOCAL FUNDING SOURCES

Local funding sources include funds that are not administered through State or Federal agencies. These funds are achieved through taxes, private contributions, and other revenues.

- **Clark County Road Fund (CRF).** The funds are established through County property tax, gas tax, and other revenues. By State law, 0.5% of the annual gas tax allocation (or approximately \$30,000 per year) must be used for special projects, such as bikeways. Figure 1 shows the various sources of revenue that currently comprise the County Road Fund. Figure 2 on the following page shows the projected revenue, expenditure, and remaining fund balance for the County Road Fund over the next six years.




Figure 1: 2006-2011 County Road Fund Breakdown

2006 - 2011 TIP Road Fund Forecast




Figure 2: 2006-2011 TIP Road Fund Forecast

- **Transportation Impact Fees (TIF).** New developments and re-developments are assessed TIF's, based on their impact on the transportation system. To be eligible for TIF funding, a project must be contained in the Traffic Impact Fee Program Technical Document that was adopted on August 17, 2001 (ordinance number 2001-08-01A). The technical document defines the allowable funding amounts for each project.
- **Road Improvement District (RID).** RID's are special projects which are funded by those properties benefiting from the improvement. The County will build the project, using revenue bonds from the RID participants. The 2006-2011 TIP does not project any revenues from RID's. Clark County will pursue a Road Improvement District if a project is applicable and the adjacent property owners express an interest in this program.
- **Frontage Improvement Agreements (Private).** A developer may enter into a frontage improvement agreement with the County where the developer pays the County for improvements along their road frontage. Most developments are required to construct frontage improvements (i.e. travel lanes, bike lanes, sidewalks, drainage) and, in cases where the development abuts a proposed road improvement project, it is often beneficial for the County to construct the improvements as part of the capital project.

- **Private/Latecomers (Private)**. According to State law and Clark County Code 12.36, new developments and re-developments may be charged “Latecomer Fees” by the County for improvements that would have been required as a part of the development, but are scheduled to be constructed by the County. These latecomer fees are collected as a reimbursement to the County for that expense. All projects shown on the six-year program matrix are considered eligible for latecomer reimbursement.

TIP EXPENDITURES

The expenditures in the 2006-2011 Transportation Improvement Program are from a combination of the sources discussed above. Figure 3 indicates the percentage each source contributes to the TIP. The County Road Fund accounts for just under half of the TIP expenditures, with various grants and traffic impact fees covering remaining costs.

Figure 4 depicts what types of projects the TIP focuses on. Improving safety and mobility is the focus of the program. It is important to note that all projects include aspects of economic development, safety, and mobility and projects generally must include benefits to at least two of those three categories to score highly on the TIP. Typically, projects score higher on safety or mobility as compared to economic development and so the chart appears skewed toward those categories.




Figure 3: 2005-2010 TIP Funding Sources

2006 - 2011 TIP Expenditures by Classification




Figure 4: 2006-2011 Expenditure by Classification

REASONABLY FUNDED PROJECTS

For purposes of concurrency evaluation, all improvement projects that are completely funded (and grant money is obligated) within the first three years of the TIP are considered reasonably funded. These projects include the following:

Ongoing Programs (locations to be determined)

- Transportation Safety Improvement Program
- Sidewalks and ADA Compliance Program
- Road Preservation Program
- Unprogrammed/Advanced Right-of-Way Purchases Program
- Neighborhood Traffic Management Program
- Environmental Impact Mitigation Program

<u>Improvement Projects</u>	<u>TIP Priority</u>
• Betts Bridge #26	A ¹
• Kline Line Bridge #1	B
• Lucia Falls Bridge #116	C
• NE 117 th Street – NE Hazel Dell Avenue to Highway 99	D
• NE 137 th Avenue – Fourth Plain Boulevard to NE 76 th Street	E
• NE 15 th Avenue – NE Union Road to NE 179 th Street	F
• NE 63 rd Street – NE Andresen Road to Interstate 205	G
• NE 72 nd Avenue – North of NE 88 th Street to NE 110 Street	H
• NE Heisson Road at NE 244 th Street Intersection	J
• NE St. Johns Road – NE 50 th Avenue to NE 72 nd Avenue	K
• NW 117 th /119 th Street – NW 7 th Avenue to Hazel Dell Avenue	N

¹ Lettered Projects = Obligated projects in the Priority Array